

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Jullie Quinn-Hunt,

Case No. 3:02CV7195

Plaintiff

v.

ORDER

Bennett Enterprises, Inc., et al.,

Defendant

This is an employment discrimination claim which has been remanded by the Sixth Circuit for further proceedings before the undersigned.

Pending is, *inter alia*, plaintiff's motion to compel discovery. The defendant opposes the motion on the ground that the information sought in the instant motion is the same, or substantially the same, as information previously sought and considered during a discovery conference on January 3, 2003.

The order issued after that conference could have been more explicit in its recitation of the fact that plaintiff's requests, with some exceptions noted in the order, were rejected. In any event, plaintiff's counsel does not dispute the fact that the requests being made now were considered and overruled at that conference.

The instant motion, is therefore, more in the nature of a motion to reconsider than an original motion for discovery.

Either way, it should be overruled on the basis that the issues raised by the motion have been considered and ruled on. To revisit those issues at this time, absent a showing of cause or need to do so,

other than the showing that was made and found insufficient during the earlier discovery conference, is not appropriate.

Nor is it necessary: plaintiff has not shown, just as she failed previously to show, that the discovery she seeks now is any more appropriate than it was when her requests were first considered.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED THAT plaintiff's motion to compel discovery be, and the same hereby is denied.

So ordered.

s/James G. Carr
James G. Carr
Chief Judge